

### **Remarks**

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on September 27, 2007, the Applicants sincerely request reconsideration and reexamination of the current application in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. The response is being submitted along with a Request for Continued Examination. The claims as presented are believed to be in allowable condition.

Claims 2-5, 7-19 and 21-24 are currently pending in the present application, and have also been rejected. Claims 2, 3, 5, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, and 22 have been amended. Claims 4, 10, and 14 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is added by the amendments.

### **Information Disclosure Statement**

The Office Action states that IDSs filed on 6/22/2007 and 7/30/2007 have not been considered, because the listed entries are illegible. Clean copies of the referenced IDSs have been faxed to the Examiner and their receipt confirmed through a phone call on October 9, 2007. The Examiner is respectfully requested to indicate any IDSs that may not have been considered due to illegibility or other reason.

### **Interview Summary**

An interview was held between the Examiner and the Applicants' attorney on October 18, 2007. The attorney explained how *Hyunh* reference is disqualified under 103(c), however, the claims have still been amended for clarification purposes and they would overcome the *Hyunh* reference even if it was eligible. The Examiner suggested the amendments be filed along with a Request for Continued Examination and a decision would be made subject to a further search.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2-5, 7-19, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Huynh et al.*, hereinafter *Huynh*, (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0198909, 12/26/2002).

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference, *Huynh*, was filed on June 27, 2002 and published on December 26, 2002. *Huynh* reference is assigned to the same assignee (Microsoft Corp.) as the present application. The present application has a filing date of June 27, 2003. Thus, *Huynh* is a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) cited for a 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection, and does not, therefore, preclude patentability under 35 U.S.C. 103(e). However, for the purposes of furthering prosecution, Applicants have amended pending claims as listed above and would like to have them reconsidered in light of the arguments below.

Amended independent claim 3 recites a computer-readable medium which stores a set of instructions which when executed performs a method for creating, editing and/or viewing an electronic document, actions on a string of text or data in the electronic document, where the method includes, *inter alia*, “parsing markup language data associated with the at least one annotated portion to assist the recognizer DLL to determine one or more labels for the at least one unannotated portion of the text string by comparing the elements of the markup language data with a plurality of stored markup language elements associated with stored labels to determine a match; and if a one or more markup language elements matches one or more stored markup language elements associated with stored labels, then labeling the text string with the associated stored label of the matched one or more markup language elements”, “transmitting the text string, the markup language data, and the one or more labels associated with at the least one annotated and the at least one unannotated portions to a plurality of action plug-ins, wherein the action plug-ins are determined based on the one or more labels”, and “determining, in the action plug-ins, one or more actions based on the markup language data and the one or more labels.”

According to claim 3, markup language data associated with an annotated portion of a text string is parsed to assist the recognizer DLL to determine labels for an unannotated portion of the text string by comparing elements of the markup language data with stored markup language elements associated with stored labels and labeling the text string with stored labels of matching markup language elements. The text string, the markup language data, and the labels

associated with the annotated as well as unannotated portions are transmitted to action-plug-ins based the labels and actions are determined in the action plug-ins based on the mark-up language data and the labels.

Amended independent claim 11 recites a method for labeling a string of text in an electronic document as the electronic document is created in an application program module that includes, *inter alia*, “as a string of text having an associated one or more Extensible Markup Language (XML) elements is entered into the electronic document, determining whether the string of text matches one of a plurality of stored strings”, “if so, then designating a label associated with the matched stored string for application to the entered string of text, wherein the label is to be transmitted to one or more action plug-ins for determining a set actions associated with the string of text, and wherein the action plug-ins to receive the label are also determined based on the label”, and “if the string of text does not match one of a plurality of stored strings, determining whether the one or more XML elements associated with the string of text is associated with a label for use with the entered string of text utilizing at least one label associated with another string in the electronic document.”

Amended independent claim 21 recites a system for providing helpful actions on a string of text in an electronic document as the string is entered into the electronic document that includes, *inter alia*, “an action dynamically linked library connected to the application program module operative to provide one or more actions associated with one or more markup language elements applied to the string of text”, “a namespace library associated with the application program module for providing one or more equivalent markup language elements that have been designated as equivalent to the one or more markup language elements applied to the string of text in the electronic document”, and “at least one recognizer dynamically linked library for providing semantic labeling to one or more portions of the string of text based on the one or more markup language elements applied to the string of text and based on one or more markup language elements associated with other strings of text in the electronic document, , wherein the at least one recognizer dynamically linked library is operative to receive the string of text, to receive the one or more markup language elements applied to the string of text in the recognizer dynamically linked library, and to transmit the string of text and associated markup language elements to a plurality of recognizer plug-ins based on the semantic labels.”

*Huynh* discloses a method and system for semantically labeling data, such as strings of text and media objects, during creation of an electronic document and providing a selection of actions that may be performed based on the semantically labeled data” (*Huynh*: Abstract, par. 10). *Huynh* further discloses “[w]hen an application program module receives a new string, such as when the user enters a new paragraph or cell value into an electronic document or edits a previously entered paragraph, the paragraph containing the new string is passed from the application program module to a recognizer DLL. During idle time, the paragraph is passed to the recognizer plug-ins. The recognizer plug-ins are executed on the paragraph to recognize keywords or perform other actions defined by the recognizer plug-in. As part of executing the recognizer plug-in, the paragraph or cell value may be broken into sentences by the recognizer plug-in. However, each recognizer plug-in is responsible for its own sentence-breaking.” (*Huynh*: Par. 10, 11).

Thus, elements of amended independent claims 3, 11, and 21 - such as parsing markup language data associated with an annotated portion of a text string to assist the recognizer DLL to determine labels for an unannotated portion of the text string by comparing elements of the markup language data with stored markup language elements associated with stored labels and labeling the text string with stored labels of matching markup language elements; transmitting the text string, the markup language data, and the labels associated with the annotated as well as unannotated portions to action-plug-ins based the labels; and determining actions in the action plug-ins based on the mark-up language data and the labels - are not taught or suggested by *Huynh* or any of the heretofore cited references. Therefore, amended claims 3, 11, and 21 are in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 5, 7-9 depend from claim 3; claims 12, 13, 15-19, and 24 depend from claim 11; and claims 22-23 depend from claim 21 with additional features. Therefore, claims 2, 5, 7-9, 12, 13, 15-19, 22-23, and 24 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for independent claims 3, 11, and 21.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment submitted with a Request for Continued Examination be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate allowance of all pending claims by the Examiner.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this amendment and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD

Date: October 23, 2007

/Carl K. Turk/  
Carl K. Turk  
Reg. No. 59,675

Merchant & Gould, LLC  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
Telephone: 404.954.5100

